



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,892	12/06/2000	Daniel J. Miller	MS1-638US	1034

22801 7590 12/12/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/731,892

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

VAN H NGUYEN

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7, 8
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the application filed on December 06, 2003. Claims 1-58 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the limit of 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is further objected to because information regarding related applications cited at pages 8-9 have not been updated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-14 and 31-45, and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Conner et al.** (U.S. 5,421,016).

As to claim 51, Conner discloses a property value-changing (*col.2, lines 6-43*) method comprising:

- providing one or more objects that support only static properties (*an application that was designed for statically defined classes*; col.2, lines 22-43 and col.5, lines 30-59); and
- simulating dynamic properties with the one or more objects by changing one or more property values at a pre-programmed time (*the original static method call can be converted to a dynamic call... this is done by replacing all the entries in the method procedure table for the dynamic class with the appropriate redispach stub entries during initialization of the class object*; col.2, lines 12-43; col.31, lines 5-17; and col.33, lines 6-22).

As to claim 52, Conner discloses the simulating comprises pre-programming at least one property value change, a time at which the property value is to be changed, and a manner in which the property value change is to take place (col.31, lines 5-17).

As to claim 53, Conner discloses the pre-programming comprises pre-programming a computer- implemented object to call the one or more objects at an appropriate time to change the one or more property values (col.31, lines 5-17).

Claim 1 is directed to computer-implemented architecture for performing the method of claim 51, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 2, Conner discloses the one or more second objects are configured to maintain property data that is used to call the one or more first objects (col.7, lines 6-46).

As to claim 3, Conner discloses the property data comprises at least one property value change that is to be made (col.2, lines 32-43).

As to claim 4, Conner discloses the property data comprises a time at which a property value change is to be made (col.2, lines 32-43).

As to claim 5, Conner discloses the property data comprises how a property value change is to be made (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

As to claim 6, Conner discloses the property data comprises one or more of the following: at least one property value change that is to be made, a time at which a property value change is to be made, and how a property value change is to be made (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

As to claim 7, Conner discloses the property data comprises at least one property value change that is to be made, a time at which a property value change is to be made, and how a property value change is to be made (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

As to claim 8, Conner discloses one or more data structures associated with the one or more second objects, individual data structures containing data that is to be used by the one or more second objects to effect a property value change (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.5 lines 30-48).

As to claim 9, Conner discloses the one or more data structures comprise an array of one or more sets of data structures, each set of data structures being associated with a property that is to be changed and containing property data that is to be used to change property values for a property (col.4, lines 40-col.5, line 41) .

As to claim 10, Conner discloses the property data comprises at least one property value change that is to be made (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

As to claim 11, Conner discloses the property data comprises a time at which a property value change is to be made (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

As to claim 12, Conner discloses the property data comprises how a property value change is to be made (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

Claim 13, includes the same subject matter as in claim 7, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 14, Conner discloses Software code embodied on a computer-readable medium which, when executed by a computer (abstract).

Claim 31, includes the same subject matter as in claim 51, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. However, claim 31 further recites “effecting at least one property value change on the one or more objects that support only static properties using the one or more programmable objects.”

Conner discloses effecting at least one property value change on the one or more objects that support only static properties using the one or more programmable objects (col.2, lines 22-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

As to claim 32, Conner discloses programming the one or more programmable objects with property data that is to be used by the one or more programmable objects to effect the at least one property value change (col.2, lines 6-43).

As to claims 33-38, note the discussion of claims 3-9 above for rejection.

As to claim 39, Conner discloses calling the one or more objects that support only static properties with the one or more programmable objects (col.2, lines 6-43).

As to claim 40, Conner discloses one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer (abstract).

Claim 41, includes the same subject matter as in claim 31, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claims 42-44, note the discussion of claims 4, 9, and 14 above for rejection.

Claim 45, includes the same subject matter as in claim 31, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. However, claim 45 further recites “the property data comprising: property value changes that are to be made, time(s) at which property value changes are to be made, and how the property value changes are to be made; and effect at least one property value change on the one or more objects that support only static properties by using the one or more programmable objects to call the one or more objects that support only static properties.”

Conner discloses the property data comprising: property value changes that are to be made, time(s) at which property value changes are to be made, and how the property value changes are to be made; and effect at least one property value change on the one or more objects that support only static properties by using the one or more programmable objects to call the one or more objects that support only static properties (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15-30, 46-50, and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Conner et al.** in view of **MacKay** (U.S.5,307,456).

As to claim 54, Conner does not explicitly disclose “a multi-media project editing application.”

MacKay teaches a multi-media project editing application (*edit multi-media*; col.6, lines 44-51 and figs.12-13).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of MacKay with Conner because it would have provided the capability for increasing flexibility of the Conner's system.

As to claim 15, note the discussion of claim 54 above for rejection.

As to claim 16, the rejection of claim 51 above is incorporated herein in full.

However, claim 16 further recites:

- a multi-media editing project; and
- one or more data structures associated with the one or more second objects, individual data structures containing property data that is to be used by the one or more second objects to effect a property value change.

Conner discloses:

- one or more data structures associated with the one or more second objects, individual data structures containing property data that is to be used by the one or more second objects to effect a property value change (col.2, lines 22-43 and col.4, lines 40-col.5, line 41).

- As to "a multi-media editing project" note the discussion of claim 54 above for rejection.

As to claims 17-23, note the discussion of claims 9-15 above for rejection.

As to claim 24, the rejection of claim 51 above is incorporated herein in full.

However, claim 24 further recites "a software- implemented matrix switch for routing input pins to output pins."

Conner does not explicitly disclose “a software- implemented matrix switch for routing input pins to output pins.”

MacKay teaches a software- implemented matrix switch for routing input pins to output pins (*Routing Switchers are also referred to as "Matrix switchers;"* col.7, lines 49-53 and col.15, lines 34-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of MacKay with Conner because it would have provided the capability for establishing a plurality of signals paths between the production resources.

As to claims 25-29, note the discussion of claims 8-12 above for rejection.

Claim 30, includes the same subject matter as in claims 10-12, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 46, includes the same subject matter as in claims 31, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. However, claim 46 further recites “a multi-media editing project.”

As to “a multi-media editing project” note the discussion of claim 54 above for rejection.

As to claims 47-50, note the discussion of claims 4, 9, 5, and 14 above for rejection.

As to claim 55, the rejection of claim 51 above is incorporated herein in full.

However, claim 55 further recites “a software- implemented matrix switch having multiple input pins and multiple output pins.”

- As to “a software- implemented matrix switch having multiple input pins and multiple output pins” note the discussion of claim 24 above for rejection.

As to claims 56-57, note the discussion of claims 8-9 above for rejection.

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 58, Conner discloses the one or more data structures comprise an array of one or more sets of data structures, each set of data structures being associated with a property whose value is to be changed and containing property data that is to be used to change that property value(col.4, lines 40-col.5, line 41) , the property data comprising: a property value that is to be changed, a time at which the property value is to be changed, and a manner in which the property value is to be changed (col.2, lines 32-43 and col.31, lines 5-17).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Banzhaf	US 6499059	issued date:12/2002
- Nusch et al.	US 6338070	issued date:01/2002
- Baleh	US 6141001	issued date:10/2000
- Wada et al.	US 6256783	issued date:06/2001
- Ritie et al.	US 5917730	issued date:06/1999
- Arnold et al.	US 5551035	issued date:08/1996
- Yamamoto	US 5515512	issued date:05/1996
- Ryu et al.	US 5481718	issued date:01/1996

Art Unit: 2126

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or fax to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 746-7238 (for After Final communications)

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications)

VHN

12/05/03



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100